

REMARKS

Claims 5-24 are pending in the application. Claims 5, 7-9, and 15-18 have been amended without acquiescence in the Office Action's basis for neither rejections nor prejudice to pursue in a related application. No new matter has been added.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 8, 13, 17 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 8, 13, 17 and 22 includes allowable subject matter.

CLAIM REJECTIONS -35 USC 112

Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as being allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The language "a specifier referring to an object that is not present in the particular database system" is supported at least on page 13, lines 8-9 and page 17, lines 13-14 in the specification as originally filed. Therefore, this subject matter is clearly enabled as described in the originally filed specification because, for example, the specification clearly describes many features including the most common reason why a miss may occur, and redirection of cursor if required when the request contains a reference to an object that is not in the database.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request this rejection to be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS -35 USC 102

Claims 5-7, 10-12, 15, 16, 19-21 and 24 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Laux (US 2001/0004737). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Office action indicates claims 8 and 17 include allowable subject matter. Claims 5 and 15 as amended explicitly recite all the limitations of claim 8 and 17 as well as all of the limitations of all intervening claims, respectively. Therefore, claims 5 and 15 as amended are allowable. Thus, claims 5-7, 10-12, 15, 16, 19-21 and 24 are not anticipated by Laux.

CLAIM REJECTIONS -35 USC 103

Claims 9, 14, 18 and 23 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Laux in view of Vange (US 2002/0002603).

As stated above, Laux does not teach or suggest claims 5 and 15 as amended.

Vange also does not teach or suggest claims 5 and 15 as amended. The Office action indicates claims 8 and 17 include allowable subject matter. Claims 5 and 15 as amended explicitly recite all the limitations of claim 8 and 17 as well as all of the limitations of all intervening claims, respectively. Therefore amended claims 5 and 15 also are not taught or suggested by Vange.

Therefore, Laux and Vange, singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention as a whole.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. **50-1105**, referencing billing number **OID 2001-092-01**. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. **50-1105**, referencing billing number **OID 2001-092-01**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 4, 2011

Vista IP Law Group LLP
1885 Lundy Avenue,
Suite 108
San Jose, CA 95131
Telephone: (408) 321-8663

By: /Jasper Kwoh/
Jasper Kwoh
Registration No. 54,921
for
Peter C. Mei
Registration No. 39,768